

### **REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application and request reconsideration of the subject application based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-6, 14-19, 32, 33, 41, 43 and 44 are pending in the subject application. Claims 1-6, 14-19, 32, 33, 41, 43 and 44 are acknowledged as being allowable by the Examiner.

Claims 27-31, 34, 36-40, 42 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Although Applicants believe that pending claims 34 and 46 are distinguishable from the cited art, each of these claims was amended in the interests of advancing prosecution so as to further claim the characteristics of the hardened bonding agent such as that set forth in claim 14. The amendments to the claims are supported by the originally filed disclosure.

### **35 U.S.C. §103 REJECTIONS**

Claims 27-31, 34, 36-40, 42 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over the cited art for the reasons provided on pages 2-6 of the above-referenced Office Action. Applicants respectfully traverse. Because claims were amended in the foregoing amendment, the following discussion refers to the language of the amended claim(s). However, only those amended features specifically relied on in the following discussion shall be considered as being made to overcome the prior art reference.

As indicated in Applicants prior remarks, the display devices of either of claims 34 and 46 are considered to be distinguishable from the cited art. Notwithstanding this, and in the interests of

advancing prosecution, a limitation is being added to each of claims 34 and 46 as to the *properties of the bonding agent used* to connect adjoining display panels. Specifically, each of claims 34 and 46 was amended to indicated that the hardened bonding agent has a flexural modulus of elasticity of not less than 4,000 kgf/cm<sup>2</sup>. Applicants submit that the added limitation clearly distinguishes the claimed invention from the cited references in all respects.

As each of claims 27-31, 36-40 and 42 depend from one of claims 34 or 46, it is submitted that at least because of their dependency from an independent claim that is considered distinguishable from the cited art, claims 27-31, 35-40 and 42 -6 also are considered to be distinguishable from the same cited art.

As provided in MPEP 2143.01, obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fine*, 837 F. 2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Jones*, 958 F. 2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). As provided above, the references cited, alone or in combination, include no such teaching, suggestion or motivation.

Furthermore, and as provided in MPEP 2143.02, a prior art reference can be combined or modified to reject claims as obvious as long as there is a reasonable expectation of success. *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Further, and as provided in MPEP-2143, the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable suggestion of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. *In re*

Applicant: Y. Izumi, et al.  
U.S.S.N. : 10/027,185  
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION  
Page 16 of 16

*Vaech*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). As can be seen from the forgoing discussion regarding the disclosures of the cited references, there is no reasonable expectation of success provided in the reference or the admitted prior art.

It is respectfully submitted that for the foregoing reasons, claims 27-31, 34, 36-40, 42 and 46 are patentable over the cited reference(s) and thus satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. As such, these claims, including the claims dependent there from are allowable.


It is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in a condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

Applicants believe that additional fees are not required for consideration of the within Response. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, the Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1105.

Respectfully submitted,  
Edwards & Angell, LLP

Date: June 30, 2004

By:



William J. Daley, Jr.  
(Reg. No. 35,487)  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205  
(617) 439- 4444

Customer No. 21,874